

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated March 24, 2005, has been received and carefully reviewed.

As preliminary matter, the Office action was discussed during a personal interview between the undersigned and the examiner on July 8, 2005, and the undersigned would like to thank the examiner for taking the time to discuss the Office action, and for the examiner's helpful suggestions and comments.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 1-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Figure 12 in view of U.S. 5,205,546 to Schisler. This combination has been carefully reviewed but is not believed to show or suggest Applicants' invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendments, claim 1 has been amended to include some the limitations of the lock mechanism recited in claim 2, and additionally, better define the engaging projection of the first engaging member to be in the axial direction, which is the direction the orifice casing, the retaining cover, and the membrane are positioned relative to one another. As discussed during the personal interview, and as indicated in the Interview Summary, Schisler does not teach or disclose the projections to be in the axial direction. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the prior art combination.

Claims 2-13 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated March 24, 2005, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 7/25/05